

They have the votes. They will try to change these programs, but they can not crush the spirit that created them.

These programs were prudent when they were created, and they are prudent now.

Those who blindly push for change have not considered the wise words of Shelley, whose poetry is as penetrating in 1995 as it was in 1821,

I am the daughter of earth and water,
And the nursling of the sky,
I pass through the pores
of the oceans and shores,
I change, but I can not die.

If they want real change, they should change the minimum wage.

If they want meaningful change, they should change the tax cut they have proposed for the wealthiest Americans to focus on working families and the middle class.

If they want change that makes a difference, they should change their Personal Responsibility Act and restore school lunch programs for children.

If they want significant change, they should change their minds about cutting college student aid programs.

We will fight these changes to the long-standing effective college student aid programs.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in accepting the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, said, "The tortuous road millions are traveling to find a new sense of dignity, will, I am convinced be widened into a superhighway of justice."

Today's college student deserves to learn about Toffler, Karr, Patton, Shelley, and King.

Change for the sake of change is obviously useless. Secretary Riley had it right when he said, "Education is a national priority." Education of our youth is an investment in our Nation's future.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there a list of Members for 5-minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is.

Mr. OWENS. There is a list? Can we follow the list?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is endeavoring to go across the aisle, and the gentleman is on the list.

Mr. OWENS. Can we follow the list?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We are following the list, but they are asking for unanimous consent. Is the gentleman objecting?

Mr. OWENS. Well, I thought the practice was to follow the list, and then after the list is finished to entertain unanimous-consent requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is just trying to recognize Members seeking unanimous consent to address the House by alternating recogni-

tion from side to side where Members are absent.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 31, two colleagues of mine, Representative GEORGE MILLER and Representative ANNA ESHOO and I did something that the leadership of this body does not want to do.

We held a hearing on the impact of the proposals by the Republican majority to cut the present system of Federal student financial aid.

We held a hearing to educate the public about these stealth proposals which would terminate investments in education to fund tax cuts for the wealthy.

We held a hearing in order that Congress may hear from the students, parents, and administrators who would be affected by these proposals.

We held a hearing because the Republican majority of this body does not want people to know the full impact of the Draconian budget slashing that the Republican majority needs to pay for their tax cut for the wealthy.

This body has passed legislation already, Mr. Speaker, which was proposed by the Republican majority which will rescind nearly \$200 million from our fiscal year 1995 student aid programs. This body will take up legislation later this week which would set in motion a series of budget cuts which will terminate what remains of it by enacting the largest tax giveaway to the rich that we have seen in recent memories.

What does the Republican majority propose?

They are proposing the elimination of the deferred interest of Stafford and Perkins loans programs which enables students to obtain loans without having to pay interest during the time they are in school.

The Republican majority is proposing eliminating campus-based programs such as college work-study which provides not only a job to help pay for an education but a job with purpose and meaning.

The Republican majority is proposing eliminating the supplemental educational opportunity grant which goes to help the most needy students for whom a Pell grant is not enough.

The Republican majority is proposing passing on to students, families, and administrators over a quarter of a billion dollars a year in increased educational costs just to the people of California. For our freshmen coming in this year, this coming year, this is a \$1 billion fee hike over the course of their education for 4 years that families, students, and schools must absorb.

In my congressional district, nearly 16,000 students would lost their Staf-

ford loan benefits at an increased cost of over \$11 million. Nearly 7,000 students would lose their supplemental education opportunity grants, an annual loss of \$2.3 million for those families.

Two thousand three hundred students in San Francisco would lose college work-study. And the majority, the Republican majority, would hand them a bill of \$2.5 million to make. All told, just for the students, families, and administrators in San Francisco, over \$17 million annually in costs would be passed back to the students, with no expectation on how those millions would be made up.

But the most telling points, the most poignant testimony, the most powerful arguments against this upside-down policy came from those who would be directly affected by those proposals.

We had an extraordinary panel of seven students and parents. The students were hard-working young men and women, bright, intelligent future leaders of our country and their parents who work hard and sacrifice to give their children every advantage, an education.

Here are some of their voices.

One senior at San Francisco State University testified. His name was Michael Rodriguez. Michael is 27, born and raised in San Francisco, and was a Marine for 9 years. He was assigned to both the Panama invasion and Operation Desert Storm and participated in the liberation of Kuwait.

During his combat assignment he was filling out his application and financial aid forms for San Francisco State. Here is what he had to say. Here is what Michael Rodriguez had to say:

For me, financial aid has allowed me to achieve my goals, for which I am thankful. I give thanks every day that programs like financial aid exist for students like myself. Students are cutting their time at school in half so they can work full-time in order to support themselves as financial aid money is becoming scarce. Financial aid, in my opinion, creates a win-win situation. Financial aid is capital investment for the future.

Diana Summy Hunt, a student at the University of San Francisco, said this about work-study: "This program has permitted me to work on campus at the financial aid office as a receptionist and file clerk. On the average, I work 18 hours per week, which allows me to pay for my books and supplies, not to mention it has also given me a variety of job experiences."

"It is not easy," she said, "juggling classes and a job. College work-study enables me to do both. If these programs were eliminated, I can honestly say that I have no idea where I will find these funds. My mother's and my finances are already stretched. What will people do to better themselves if education is out of the question?"

Perhaps one of the most heartfelt testimonials came from Ronelle Garibaldi, a member of a two-income family whose son, Michael, also attends